Columbia University
in the City of New York

College of Physicians and Surgeons

Library

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Open Knowledge Commons

http://www.archive.org/details/memorialoftruste02coll

MEMORIAL

OF

THE TRUSTEES

OF THE

COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS

OF

THE CITY OF NEW-YORK,

IN REPLY TO THE "MEMORIAL OF THE PROFESSORS OF RUTGERS' MEDICAL FACULTY."

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY J. & J. HARPER, 82 CLIFF-STREET

1830.

Spec-611
M-611
R
740
.N481
1830
C.2

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Trustees of the College of Physicians and Surgeons prepared the following Memorial, with the intention of presenting it to the Legislature while the subject was pending of granting a charter for another medical college in this city. Although the rejection of the bill in the Senate, in the mean time, has, as they hope, for ever put the subject at rest in the Legislature, the Trustees still think it a duty which they owe to those members of the Senate who voted against the bill, and to their own body, who have uniformly opposed it, to publish the following facts, that the nature of the controversy may be duly appreciated, and the minds of those persons disabused who have read the extraordinary document of the Medical Faculty of Rutgers' College.

New-York, April 12. 1830.

MEMORIAL

OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF THE CITY OF NEW-YORK, IN REPLY TO THE "MEMORIAL OF THE PROFESSORS OF RUTGERS' MEDICAL FACULTY."

To the Honourable the Legislature of the State of New-York.

Your memorialists do not regret that an opportunity is afforded them, of exhibiting to your honourable body the character of the testimony and the nature of the means relied upon by the individuals, styling themselves the Rutgers' Medical Faculty, in urging before the Legislature their claims to a charter, which will give to them the two-fold power of trustees and professors of a second medical college in the city of New-York.

If the document which has been gravely presented to your honourable body, purporting to be a refutation of the facts stated by your present memorialists in a former communication, is itself founded in truth, then indeed it is entitled to consideration; if, on the other hand, it can be made to appear that it consists of misrepresentations, erroneous statements, and fallacious reasoning, then it is not only unworthy of credit, but the authors of it are undeserving of legislative confidence and patronage. Now, your memorialists are willing to rest the issue of the whole matter upon their success or failure in showing that the document in question is intrinsically untrue or fallacious, and obviously calculated to deceive and mislead. And that your memorialists may not be accused of perverting

the meaning, or unfairly representing their opponents, they have taken pains to give the entire document in their own language.

Their memorial commences as follows:—

"The College of Physicians and Surgeons of this city apply to "your honourable body against granting a charter to the undersigned, "and our opponents allege against us in substance, that if we obtain "a charter, we will break down their institution. It is clear, how- "ever, that we cannot effect this result, unless by evincing greater "merit: and shall the Legislature discourage the greater for the "sake of favouring the less? Such is not the course of the enlight- "ened patrons of science or industry in any thing else; it is also at "variance with the justice which the free citizens of this community "have a right to expect from their representatives."

Is it true that we have alleged against our opponents, that if they obtain a charter they will break down our institution? It is not true. Our language was as follows:—"The number of "students resorting to the city of New-York is not, and never "has been, sufficient, competently, to support two schools; "and therefore, the establishment of a second college must "unavoidably result in the eventual ruin of one or both, unless "supported by legislative aid." Now, by referring to that memorial it will be seen, that this opinion was founded on a statement of facts most conclusive and unanswerable. And while your memorialists repeat the sentiment, and deprecate a contest which would be most unprofitable to both parties, and highly injurious to the public, they believe, and they always have believed, it would terminate in the triumph of the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

The great *merit* to which the gentlemen modestly allude in the foregoing paragraph, will be examined in the sequel.

"We have no compulsory process to bring students to our lectures: "we have no bonus to offer them of degrees from the Regents, which "shall be a license to practice. One thing only have we to offer them

" for their fees and attendance; it is knowledge, which, under every
" disadvantage, they come to find in our institution. The complain-
" ants against us also make it an accusation that we put the expenses
" of education at our institution as high as at their own; which shows,
" at least, that we do not seek to take a mean advantage, or to found
" success upon aught but merit. In those circumstances we humbly
" submit, that impartiality is most becoming the Legislature, and that
" it should not raise impediments to the free choice of students, as-
" sailing their rights and our industry together, with the intent of
" constraining scholars, against their judgment, to resort to teachers
" whom they do not voluntarily prefer. If we have committed a
" fault, our opponents are unable to profit by it; so they pray the
" Legislature to punish us for our prosperous attainments."

We will not stop to inquire, whether the gentlemen might not as well bring students to their lectures by compulsion, as by *stratagem;* but is not the very object of their petition, the power of offering "a bonus of degrees from the Regents?" If not, if the pupil seeks only for that *knowledge* which these gentlemen only, it would seem, are competent to impart, where is the ground of controversy? Surely we have no desire to extinguish this luminous body; we would rather rejoice to see their influence in promoting science increased in *reality,* to the unparalleled degree to which they imagine it already arrived.

But is it true, that your memorialists make an *accusation* against their opponents, for putting the expenses of education in Rutgers' College equal to their own? It is not true. We say, that "so far from competition having had the effect of " lowering the price of education, the contrary has been the " result. In Rutgers' College during the present session, the " ticket of the professor of anatomy has been raised from " fifteen to twenty dollars, and the matriculation fee from three " to five dollars for each student. Indeed, such seems to be " the unavoidable consequence; when the number of students " is limited, the highest possible prices must be obtained, to " meet the expenses of the establishment."

By what perversion of meaning can this language be construed into an accusation? As well might it be called an assault and battery. No; this gratuitous charge is very obviously designed as a suitable exordium to the succeeding part of the sentence; viz. the success of the gentlemen depends upon their magnanimity and their *peculiar merit.* From these premises, the Faculty of Rutgers' deduce some instructive and salutary hints, which they kindly suggest for the better conduct of the Legislature.

"Say they, 'the number of students in this city is not adequate to "'support two schools;' but we would remind those gentlemen, that a "faculty of physic existed formerly in Columbia College, and that for "a great number of years it monopolized the whole medical education "of the city; yet it never flourished. We know that one of its most "important and popular courses, had, at one time, but seven students; "that the whole number never exceeded sixty-four, and never "reached so high but once. During the existence of this faculty, and "in despite of its opposition—the College of Physicians was char-"tered, and the new school in no very long time counted two "hundred."

In relation to the first part of the foregoing sentence, your memorialists do not think it sufficiently relevant to the case in question, to require that they should examine into the condition of the medical school connected with Columbia College twenty years ago. But your honourable body is invited, particularly, to compare the concluding sentence with the following *facts,* extracted from the minutes of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, as recorded by the gentlemen themselves. During the first three years of the existence of the College, when one pupil from each county in the state was *gratuitously* admitted to the lectures—the numbers were as follows:

In 1807	-	-	-	-	52
1808	-	-	-	-	76
1809	-	-	-	-	84

During the next three years, when pupils were not admitted

gratuitously, with all the benefit of competition, the number of pupils was,

In 1810	24
1811	31
1812	44

Now, what do the gentlemen mean when they say, that in despite of the opposition of Columbia College, the number of pupils soon increased to "*two hundred?*"

At this time, 1813, the injurious effects of two schools were felt by both so severely, that a union between them was formed, the faculty of Columbia College being merged in the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The gentlemen now composing the Faculty of Rutgers' College, were Professors; and for 13 years, they and their associates continued in undisturbed possession of the College. During this long period, in the full exercise of their meritorious powers, of which they never cease to make mention, and aided, too, by large grants of money from the State, what were the results of their wisdom and talents? It will be found by the following statement, that it was *nine years* after the union of the two colleges, before the number of pupils increased to two hundred: that then the number began to diminish; and that in 1825, the last year of their labours, they had but 158 pupils.

In 1813	99	In 1820	185
1814	no returns	1821	202
1815	149	1822	201
1816	142	1823	201
1817	144	1824	195
1818	173	1825	158
1819	155		

"The number of medical students resorting to a seminary of medi-
"cal education is not founded on the population of the place, but on
"the reputation of the school, and the liberal principles by which it is

"governed. Edinburgh has from seven to eight hundred students of "medicine, and a population less than that of New-York; but it has "celebrated professors; none are oppressed by superior authority, and "they draw students from all parts of Europe and America. Within "four hours' ride is the University of Glasgow; and they both prosper, "notwithstanding their proximity; but Glasgow has renowned profes- "sors likewise, and a class of between three and four hundred students "of medicine; nor is there any attempt made in Scotland to depress "one school, in order to elevate the other. They are left to prosecute "their separate interests, as is the case in other pursuits, by service- "able exertion and superiority of talent."

The number of students resorting to a medical school does not, it is true, depend upon the population of the city, or town, where the school is situated; but the number does depend, in a very great degree, upon the extent of the surrounding district. Thus Philadelphia has fewer inhabitants than the city of New-York; but the great body of students who resort to Philadelphia come from those Southern States which have no medical schools of their own; whereas, New-York is surrounded by a comparatively small district containing a great number of medical schools.

As to the example of Europe on this subject, it is worthy of imitation. There are but two medical schools in England, three in Scotland, two in Ireland, three in France, one in Prussia, &c.; but in no *city* in Europe is there more than one school having the power to confer medical degrees.* It is only in the United States that the experiment of establishing two medical colleges in the same city has been made; and thus far, as will presently be shown, it has clearly proved prejudicial to the interest and harmony of the profession. We have never objected to the existence of rival colleges in separate cities, but we do object to the principle of establishing more than one

* It is necessary to mention that there are colleges of surgeons and apothecaries that have the power to grant licenses to those of their respective professions, but not of conferring the degree of Doctor of Medicine.

college in the same city; and we challenge our opponents to show, that in a single instance where it has been done, more good than evil has not been the consequence.

"In Paris there are several schools of medicine: every hospital is "one, provided with a set of professors. They teach, and such stu- "dents attend them as please. The professor of greatest reputation "has the largest class; the dull or incompetent would have few "hearers. When the student has completed his studies, he gets an "examination before a body of physicians, called the Faculty of "Paris, and a diploma is the reward of his proficiency. Similar to "this is the practice of the most celebrated school of medicine in "Germany, that of Berlin. It has more than twenty professors of "medicine, any of whom the student may attend at his pleasure, and "with the certificates of those attended, he obtains an examination "from the faculty of Berlin, and a diploma or not according to his "deserts. Thus there is emulation between the professors, but no "hostility between the schools."

The foregoing statement is calculated to lead those who are not familiar with the facts, to believe that the schools spoken of in Paris and Berlin are in some degree analogous in their organization to the medical colleges in this country. Not so. There are indeed many teachers—men who lecture on the various departments of medical science in those cities, and also in London; but none of those Schools, excepting one in Paris and one in Berlin, have power to confer medical honours, or give license to practise.

"In Philadelphia, with a smaller population than New-York, there "are near six hundred students of medicine attending its two "schools, the University and Jefferson College; but the constituted "authorities do not oppress one to favour the other. When Jefferson "College applied for a charter, it was violently opposed by the Uni- "versity, as we are here, and through the same selfish motive; but "the Legislature of Pennsylvania granted the charter notwith- "standing, and medical education in Philadelphia has been the better "for it."

The foregoing is not the only instance in which the success-

ful progress and flourishing condition of the Philadelphia schools have been triumphantly set forth, to demonstrate the utility of city-rivalship in medical institutions. An examination of the facts in relation to these schools, will show with what correctness such representations have been made.

In the year 1824, when there was but one medical school in Philadelphia, the number of students was 424. In the year 1825, Jefferson College was established, and had about 100 pupils; there were in the University that year 487 students. From that time to the present, the aggregate number of medical students in Philadelphia has every year been *diminishing;* so that this session (1829-30), there have been but 362 in the school of the University, and 112 in Jefferson College; making in the whole 474:—a less number by 13 than attended the University alone in 1825; and more than 100 less than attended the two schools the same year. In Baltimore, the result of two schools has been equally striking. The number of pupils in that city was reported at 300, when there was but one school. It has now diminished to about 200 in both. This, in addition to what has been stated on the subject in relation to our own city, is the amount of all that can be adduced, from experience, to show the influence of two medical colleges in one city, so far as respects the number of pupils. And this is the most favourable aspect of the whole matter. The perpetual hostilities existing between the respective parties, and the feuds and jealousies engendered by them, not only injure the character of the schools, but are manifestly hurtful to the profession at large, and to the best interests of the community.

"Our opponents complain that their incomes are small, and ask "the Legislature to act against our institution, that they may be "enabled to make larger profits. They must have great reliance "upon their influence in the Legislature, when they hope to enlist it "as a party to their personal interests. In default of this measure,

"they threaten your honourable body with a demand for Legislative "aid to make up deficiencies. Happy they who have such excellent "friends and bountiful patrons! As for us, we assure you we shall "make no call for pecuniary assistance, satisfied that upon an equal "footing, we and they would have precisely all the remuneration we "deserved. The effects of a fair competition between the colleges "in this city has not yet been tried. One of them has been fostered "indeed by the Regents of the Legislature, and yet with all this nursing, "it does not greatly thrive. The other has suffered under the heavy "hands of both; but yet there is something within it which maintains "it still. With only a clear stage and no favour, it might yet entitle "itself to the approbation of those eminent bodies. After four years "of exclusive favour to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of "Barclay-street, it comes forward now for an increase of the tariff. "Such are the blessings which the exclusive system showers upon "its supporters, and we trust your honourable body will entertain a "just sense of their value and importance."

Perhaps nothing in this singular document is more surprising than the unparalleled effrontery of the foregoing paragraph. In referring to the records of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, it appears, that under the administration of these gentlemen, who, were not only professors, but who, with their professorial associates, constituted a majority of the board of trustees, and managed the moneyed concerns of the institution, the sum of $66,457 27, the munificent bounty of the State, was expended, *it was said*, in conducting the affairs of the College: and when these gentlemen resigned their professorships, the institution was actually encumbered with a debt, as they allege, of $20,000, claimed to be due to *them*,—the very persons whom the State invested with its property, in trust, for the purposes of medical science; and for this sum of more than eighty-six thousand dollars, there was nothing to show but the bare walls of the college, and a small library: so that if the claim of these quondam professors had been acknowledged, the institution would actually have been bankrupt. Well may *they* congratulate those "who have such excellent friends and bountiful patrons." Well may *they* dispense with further pecuniary assist-

ance! Well, it may be supposed, could they afford to erect another college edifice! And these facts serve well to explain, what that "*something* within it" is, "which maintains it still!"

How has it been in relation to the moneyed concerns of the college since the appointment of the present Faculty? Your honourable body well know, that not a dollar has been received from the Legislature, excepting the continuance of an annuity of $500, received from the honourable the Regents of the University; and that with this, many of the minor debts, contracted by the former professors, have been paid off.

"Our opponents object to us that we fill the office of Professors in "the schools which we established. Would they have us erect it at "our expense to hand it to them for their emolument? We were "Professors in the College of Physicians, and give lectures now, as "when we were members of that body. We began by investing "twenty-five thousand dollars in a college edifice, and, acting like "other discreet persons, we keep the control of our own estate; "although we devote it to public use. In this manner banks, turn-"pikes, insurance companies, &c., are private property, and public "benefits. They require that the offices in the Rutgers' Medical "Faculty shall be open to the competition of all the scientific men "of the country: so they are, as often as there are vacancies; but "we do not suffer favouritism to fill them."

We will not dwell upon the absurdity of these sentiments: your honourable body know better than your memorialists, what would be the result to the cause of science, should every man, or body of men, who are able to erect a college edifice, be permitted to assume the responsibility of controlling the concerns, and dispensing the important powers and privileges, which are now wisely intrusted by your honourable body to the Board of Regents. That the gentlemen have a right to invest their money in a college edifice, or if they please in a court-house, no one will deny; but we have yet to learn, that as a matter of course, they will thereby be entitled to the prerogative of professors of colleges or of judges.

"Trustees of a college may, from private friendship, appoint me-
"diocrity to professorships, and seek to enrich it by monopolies; but
"individual interest is not so generous. When your memorialists
"had first a vacancy in their body, they appointed to it the most able
"Professor they could find; for they well knew that their individual
"interest was increased or lessened by the reputation of their school
"and the ability of its teachers. No trustees could say as much.
"When a vacancy occurred a second time in their body, they followed
"the same course. *To the most worthy* was their rule of selection,
"without distinction of place or country, justly considering the re-
"public of letters as extending to, and embracing, all enlightened
"nations."

The foregoing paragraph affords another striking specimen of the characteristic fallacy of the memorial of the gentlemen of Rutgers'. They have fallen into the unaccountable mistake, that the *Trustees* have the power of appointing professors. Since the gentlemen have become professors by "a spontaneous association of the elements,"* they seem to have forgotten that they were *once* indebted for those honours to the honourable the Regents of the University. Surely your memorialists have never arrogated to themselves the authority which their opponents thus gratuitously ascribe to them; and though the gentlemen exult that such is *their* independence and power, your memorialists still think that your honourable body have more wisely confided these important trusts to the Regents of the University. But as it is almost incredible that our opponents should be ignorant in relation to the power of appointment, it is natural to inquire, why they should ascribe it to the *Trustees*, instead of the *Regents?* It is sufficiently obvious to your memorialists, that it was for the purpose of charging upon the former, that flagrant abuse of official power, which even their hardihood dare not impute to the latter.

"The last effort of our opponents is, to bring up the futile and
"often-confuted accusation concerning the debts of the College of

---

* Vide Dr. Mitchill's Lectures on the origin of *Monads*.

"Physicians and Surgeons, in the hope, perhaps, that as the members "of the Legislature often change, there may be found some one among "them unacquainted with that matter, and who may be deluded by "the hardihood of the charge. To this we simply say at present, "that any inculpation of the former professors is unfounded, is un- "true. And to prove this, our task is easy: we refer to the journals "of the house, where will be found the report of Messrs. S. Van "Rensselaer, General Talmadge, and Mr. Marcy, who investigated the "subject, and attest that no charge could be brought against those "professors. In its necessities they lent money to the College, be- "cause they would be the most lenient creditors; and they left the "College, because, with other vexations, they were subjected to an "arbitrary taxation, which was tantamount to a confiscation of their "debt."

Your memorialists are not surprised that their opponents should be startled by the ghostly train of associations, unavoidably awakened by the subject to which they have alluded in the last paragraph. We would not wantonly disturb the peace of the gentlemen, by a recurrence to transactions which were so disastrous to their reputation and to the cause of medical science; but when it is said by them, that "any inculpation of the former professors is unfounded, is untrue," your memorialists are in duty bound to state, that without explanation it is calculated to mislead. If the gentlemen mean it to be understood, that the reports of the Regents, and of their committee, exculpate them from any charge which rendered them *obnoxious to penal law*, their assertion is doubtless true; but if (as would be inferred from their statement just quoted) they mean to represent that there is any thing in those reports, contradictory of aught that has been advanced by your memorialists in relation to the moneys expended during their connexion with the College, or the financial embarrassments of the institution at the time of their resignation, then, we repeat, their statement is evasive, and calculated to mislead; for not a statement has been made by your memorialists in relation to the improvident expenditures of the former professors, or to the debts of the College

contracted by them, that is not confirmed by the records of the institution. What but an acknowledgment of these facts can be inferred from the last sentence of the foregoing paragraph? "*In its necessities* they (the professors) lent money to the College, because they would be the most lenient creditors." For what did the College want money? It had received, as we have already shown, more than sixty-six thousand dollars, while under their own management; and if its *credit* were good, and only a temporary loan were required, why the necessity of such lenient creditors? And finally, why the necessity of that "arbitrary taxation," (by the Regents, be it recollected,) which, "with other vexations," induced them to leave their places in the College? Vexations they have indeed had; and we would ask the gentlemen whether *one*, more ominous than the fear of the "confiscation of their debt," was not, that at the time of their resignation, a proposition had been for some days pending in the Board of Regents, to dismiss them all from the College?

"We humbly solicit a consideration of the premises, and that your "honourable body will adopt that rule of free exertion which is now "universally admitted to be the most conducive to improvement in "every medical pursuit.

"We have not the least objection to the Regents having a superin- "tending inspection over the teaching part of our establishment, in "common with other institutions of the state.

"All which is respectfully submitted.

"DAVID HOSACK,
"WM. J. MACNEVEN,
"VALENTINE MOTT,
"JOHN W. FRANCIS.

"City of New-York, March 10th, 1830."

Your memorialists acquiesce with their opponents, in humbly soliciting the consideration of your honourable body in the premises; and after having reviewed every point of controversy between us, we only ask that favour and patronage may be bestowed or withheld, according to the soundness or fallacy

of the arguments and representations submitted. With an honest conviction, that the more scrutinizing the investigation, the more sure will be the triumph of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, your memorialists would confidently inquire, whether a single fact has been adduced by their opponents, to refute or invalidate the statements in their former memorial—and whether a single argument in favour of their claim has been urged, which has not been shown to be fallacious? The gentlemen of Rutgers' have indeed made frequent allusion to their *superior merit*, and on the other hand, they have not failed in the present instance to insinuate, what they have often said before, that the professors in the College of Physicians and Surgeons are unqualified by their ignorance and dulness for the stations which they fill. This calumny the gentlemen have no doubt recurred to the more readily, because they knew full well that their rivals would never condescend to reply to it; and your memorialists regret that they are obliged to repel the aspersion, in order to disabuse the minds of those who are unacquainted with the respective parties. But they do assert, without fear of contradiction, that if the learned Faculty of Rutgers' College is held in higher estimation than that of the Professors of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, either as teachers or practitioners, it is only in the opinion of the populace, founded on the repeated declarations to that effect of the gentlemen themselves. Such is not the opinion of those pupils who have attended the lectures of both; such is not the opinion of the most intelligent portion of this community: and such certainly is not the opinion of the majority of the best informed and most respectable physicians in this city. It is true, the present Professors of the College of Physicians and Surgeons have not rendered themselves notorious by lauding their own names, nor have they seen fit to step aside from their professorial duties. to quarrel with their assail-

ants. They have been devoted to the object for which they were appointed — to the instruction of medical students; and we would now confidently inquire, whether, from aught that has been adduced by their opponents, there is the least proof that they have not fulfilled their respective duties ably and faithfully? Does it appear that the expectations of the medical profession, or the community at large, have not been fully justified by the new Faculty? Has any complaint ever been heard from the pupils who have attended their lectures, or from the Trustees of the College, or from the Regents of the University? In short, has complaint ever been heard from any source, independent of their predecessors in the College? Your memorialists venture to say, it has not; and after the repeated declaration of the gentlemen, since their resignation, that they would break down the College, we humbly submit to your honourable body, what weight ought to be attached to their defamation—what claim they have to legislative encouragement and favour.

Would that our opponents were as sparing in their assertions as they are in their proofs—then would we respect their arguments and honour their intentions; but we appeal to your honourable body, whether from their own showing we are not compelled to withhold from them both confidence and respect. They insinuate that the present professors owe their appointments to private friendship (a compliment which the Regents of the University will no doubt fully appreciate). They accuse us of hoping to enlist the influence of "the Legislature as a party to our personal interest;" of "threatening your honourable body with a demand for legislative aid to make up deficiencies;" of seeking to "enrich the College by monopolies." Now, what evidence is there in support of these grave charges? Your honourable body know full well there is none. Was it from motives of personal friendship that two members of the

present Faculty were invited to resign eligible appointments which they held in other highly respectable institutions, to accept of professorships in this? or was it not rather that those gentlemen were better qualified than any other that could be selected to fill the stations they occupy?—Again, we would ask our opponents, on what authority do they say that petitions by your memorialists to the Legislature for money have been accompanied by a *threat*, and that application is now made by them "for an increase of the tariff?" We fearlessly aver that these assertions are without proof and without foundation. If your memorialists have at any time solicited legislative aid, it was not for the purpose of enriching the professors; it was not "to enrich the College," but it was for the purpose of relieving the institution from embarrassments under which it labours, in consequence of the numerous prosecutions of these "lenient creditors." And what is the nature of the "monopoly" concerning which our opponents have been so clamorous? It is this—the Trustees of the College of Physicians and Surgeons ask, that the present Faculty may be permitted to occupy the places which were voluntarily abandoned by their rivals, and to which they were appointed by the Regents of the University, unmolested by the hostility of another College, till they have had an opportunity to show their power or inability to build up a school, worthy of the population of the city and the character of the State; and if after thirteen years' probation, their success shall not have equalled that of their predecessors, your memorialists hereby solemnly promise, for themselves and their successors, to abandon their trust for ever in favour of the medical Faculty of Rutgers' College. Your memorialists ask for the present Professors this simple privilege, because, as is well known to your honourable body, they accepted their appointment with an implied pledge on the part of the State, through the Regents of the University, that they should at

least be allowed the same field for the exercise of their talents and enterprise which had been abdicated by their opponents.

This is what the gentlemen now petitioning for another charter denominate "the exclusive system," and from the vehemence of their opposition to it, it might be supposed they were moved by an hereditary and unchanging aversion to an alarming scientific aristocracy. It remains to be shown with what consistency the gentlemen are now contending for the opposite "rule of free exertion;" and as your memorialists would not willingly misrepresent them by quoting an abstract or isolated opinion, they humbly solicit a careful comparison of the sentiments which these gentlemen have published at various times, in regard to the proper organization, government, and patronage of medical schools. On one occasion, the learned President of the Rutgers' Medical Faculty warmly approves of "vesting the internal government of the College in a Board of Trustees, to be composed of the President, Vice-President, Professors, and Treasurer of the College; with others of the most respectable members of the profession;—under the superintending and paternal care of the Regents of the University."* On another occasion, the same distinguished individual exults, in behalf of himself and associates, that they have assumed supreme power; and, as exclusive judges in all matters appertaining to the administration of the College, which themselves have established, hail the time as a new and auspicious era in medical science. He remarks—"Now no longer under the restraints of rivals in the profession, envious of our prosperity; no longer impeded in our progress by *a Board of Control*: but happily left to our own judgment and experience to direct us, how far, and in what manner we can best offer instruction," &c.†

---

* Dr. Hosack's letter to Dr. Stringham, published 1811.

† Inaugural Discourse, by Dr. Hosack, 1826.

Again, the same gentlemen say, in an address to the Legislature, in 1816, in speaking of the Medical Faculty then in connexion with the identical College with which themselves have since been united,—"Self-created medical institutions of this kind, require but slight patronage to spring up, whenever the good opinion which a few gentlemen entertain of their own talents shall induce them to assume the office and character of professors. Their task is also very easy; for they are accountable to nobody for whatever they do, or what they neglect. Far different is the spirit in which the College of Physicians and Surgeons is founded, under the sanction of the Legislature."

While there was a faculty of medicine in connexion with Columbia College, it was assailed by them with unceasing hostility; and the existence of two schools in one city deprecated as an evil most portentous to the interests of medical science. At a much later period, in a memorial addressed to the Legislature, they say—"The practice of all nations shows the impropriety of incorporating two medical schools in the same city; and that the advancement of medical science is best promoted by one:" and the schools of Edinburgh, Paris, Philadelphia, and other cities, are cited to sustain their position.

At a still later period, one of their members, in a letter to one of the Regents, exclaims—"Medical science will be ruined in this State, if the Regents augment the number of medical schools."

Now, these same gentlemen are importunately soliciting a charter for another school in this city, decrying the injustice of existing monopolies, strenuously contending for the utility of rivalship, and again they cite the schools of Edinburgh, Paris, and Philadelphia (with what propriety we have already shown), to illustrate the reasonableness of their application.

Ask them what has taken place since 1824, that now renders it expedient to have two medical schools, and they will tell you "there has been a vast increase of population;" while at the same moment they assert, in the document which we have been reviewing, "that the number of medical students resorting to a seminary of medical education, is not founded on the population of the place," but on the merits of the teachers.

After the consolidation of the two schools, when all opposition was suspended, and our opponents left to prosecute their career under circumstances singularly auspicious to their private interest as well as to their reputation, instead of depending upon their merits to build up a useful and profitable school, they immediately began to implore assistance from the Legislature; and the most liberal and often repeated grants from that honourable body did not stop their importunity while they were connected with the College. Now, their views on this subject, too, have changed, and they declare that men of their merit will never need pecuniary favour.

Contradictory opinions like these might be multiplied to an almost unlimited number; but your memorialists have only a wish to cite enough to show that their opponents are egregiously wanting in judgment and stability, or that their schemes have been selfish, and their statements insincere. In either case, they must be deemed unqualified for the important trusts for which they are petitioners. We are willing to leave it with them to settle the alternative.

We therefore pray your honourable body, to leave them and their enterprise, for the sake of the community, and the peace of the profession, to the certain and inevitable result of their own unquestioned merit. For since this is so fully established, that pupils "under every disadvantage go to their institution," it must indubitably continue to flourish, independent of that "bonus of degrees" which they now so modestly and re-

spectfully solicit; or rather, which they will condescend to accept, provided the Regents will go no further than to inspect "the teaching part of their establishment." The prayer of these petitioners is, "for a clear stage, *and no favour.*" We most sincerely desire that it may be granted, and that the favour of your honourable body will be reserved for those who deserve and can duly appreciate it. All which is respectfully submitted.

By order of the Board of Trustees,

JOHN WATTS, Jr., *President.*

Nichol H. Dering, *Register.*

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

This book is due on the date indicated below, or at the expiration of a definite period after the date of borrowing, as provided by the library rules or by special arrangement with the Librarian in charge.

DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE	DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE
	NOV 6 1951		
C28(842)M50			

Annex

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
0050082879
M-R747.C7
C72
1830